UNITED
NATIONS

A

General Assembly

Distr.
GENERAL

A/CN.10/PV.157
29 April 1991

ENGLISH

DISARMAMENT COMMISSION

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 23 April 1991, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. HOHENFELLNER (Austria)

- General exchange of views (continued)

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages, preferably in the same language as the text to which they refer. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also, if possible, incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent, within one week of the date of this document, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Any corrections to the records of the meetings of this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

91-60566 4698V (E)

READEX FICHE

The meeting was called to order at 10.40 a.m.

GENERAL EXCHANGE OF VIEWS (continued)

Mr. OUDOVENKO (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the delegation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, I should like to extend congratulations to you and your colleagues on being elected to your posts and to wish you every success and fruitful work. We know you as an eminent Austrian diplomat and a man greatly respected in the United Nations. Your experience and sagacity will, I am sure, contribute to the Commission's successful work.

I should like to express the profound sympathy and sincere condolences of the delegation of the Ukraine to the Government and people of Costa Rica in connection with the recent disaster, the destructive earthquake that has claimed so many victims. This tragedy confirms once again that there are quite enough natural disasters in the world without our creating additional, man-made ones. Our Commission's task must be to eradicate just such dangers, the threats of armed confrontation and military conflict.

The world community is now at a turning-point in its development. The end of the cold war, the lowering of the excessive level of armaments and the abandonment of confrontational methods in favour of constructive cooperation have all begun to figure in the international arena. New structures are being created for a new world order to be based on cooperation, mutual understanding and trust. As a result, the level of international security is rising and there is a wider understanding of how dangerous and hopeless any approach based on military force is in this age of nuclear missiles, as well as a hope that a radically new, more stable and more lasting peace can at last be achieved.

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

The past year was filled with important events and profound changes in the life of the entire world. Dynamic advances were made in the peaceful renewal in Europe and in the reunification of Germany. The Charter of Paris for a New Europe, the joint declaration issued by the States members of the the Warsaw Pact and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, the statement issued by the Warsaw Pact countries on the elimination of the Pact's military organs and structures, and other documents have all laid the foundations in Europe for a radically new system of security, based not on confrontation but on interaction and cooperation.

The crisis in the Persian Gulf has forced us to recognize the danger that the cold-war confrontation of the past could be replaced by crisis situations, conflicts and even wars further south, reflecting the exacerbation of the contradictions between the wealthier and the less developed countries. However, the prompt joint action, with world-wide support, that defeated the Iraqi aggression gives us hope that even in such cases the world can find an effective solution.

The past year also witnessed the proclamation of the independence of Namibia, the settlement of the situation in Nicaragua and progress towards settling the conflicts in Cambodia, Angola, Ethiopia and other areas. Appreciable improvements took place in South Africa.

There were also dynamic changes in our own country. One of the most important events to occur in the Ukraine since the last session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission was the adoption by the Supreme Soviet, the Parliament of the Republic, of the historic Declaration of Ukrainian State Sovereignty on 16 July 1990. That Declaration represents a milestone in the

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

creation of a truly democratic society in the Republic and the construction of a State based on law. It proclaims the fundamental principles of Ukrainian sovereignty, democracy and State authority in the Republic, economic self-sufficiency and safe and political, socio-economic and cultural development. It lays the groundwork for a new Ukrainian constitution and new Ukrainian laws and for the conclusion of a new Treaty of Union. The Declaration on State Sovereignty expresses the will of the people of the Ukraine, which was convincingly demonstrated on 17 March of this year in a national Ukrainian plebiscite. Over 80 per cent of those participating in the plebiscite voted in favour of the principles set forth in the Declaration.

The sections of the Declaration that deal with the Ukraine's activities in foreign policy state that the Ukrainian SSR is an equal member of the international community, that it actively contributes to the strengthening of world peace and international security and that it participates directly in the pan-European process and European structures. The Ukrainian SSR acknowledges the superiority of universal human values over class values and the primacy of the universally recognized norms of international law over those of municipal law.

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

The Declaration solemnly proclaims that the Ukraine intends to be in future a permanently neutral State which does not participate in military blocs and follows three principles: that it will not accept nuclear weapons on its soil, that it will not produce them and that it will not acquire them. Those are the foreign-policy principles of the Ukraine to ensure its national security.

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic attaches great importance to the activities of the United Nations and its constituent bodies in maintaining international peace and security and contributing to arms reduction and disarmament. Our representatives take an active part in the work of various forums, some of them in the Ukraine. For example, in June of this year there will be held in Kiev a seminar, organized by the United Nations Institute for Training and Research, on many problems concerning the verification of disarmament agreements. Our experts have taken part in the work of similar seminars held in Vienna and Prague this year on the question of strengthening confidence and international security. The Ukrainian SSR will continue to expand its activities in this important field of work of the United Nations and other bodies.

The wind of renewal has blown through the Disarmament Commission too. Last year's session showed that the Commission can work intensively and fruitfully. We hope that the agreed "Ways and means to enhance the functioning of the Disarmament Commission" will enable it to make full use of its great potential and of previously unrecognized opportunities. The positive solution of a number of important organizational and procedural problems - ordering the agenda, shortening the time-limits for the consideration of concrete questions of current importance, more precise

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

regulation of work - and the constructive spirit shown in reaching agreement on the agenda give reason to hope that the Commission will prove itself to be a truly effective body in substantive matters as well.

The agenda of this session worked out through intensive efforts, includes important problems which define the main lines of disarmament work at this stage.

The need to consider problems relating to nuclear disarmament in the Commission is obvious. Even today, when the centre of gravity of international activity is gradually moving away from military and political problems to problems in the socio-economic sphere, when the non-military aspects of international security are increasingly "competing" with its military aspects, the role of nuclear forces and armaments is still extremely important. Although the total elimination of nuclear weapons remains the all-important final goal, during the process of attaining it the remaining "nuclear reserve of military security" must be kept as small as possible and be gradually reduced to the zero level.

Another important step should be to place special emphasis on the reduction of destabilizing armaments - first-strike weapons and other offensive weapons - while less destabilizing weapons are temporarily retained. The Commission could try to determine more precisely which weapons belong to which category.

In our view, the time is near for the process of negotiations on nuclear disarmament to become all-embracing. In other words, today, when shorter-range nuclear weapons have already been liquidated and the liquidation of medium-range weapons is near, when we hope that there will soon be a Soviet-United States agreement on a significant reduction of strategic

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

offensive weapons and that talks on tactical weapons will begin, the negotiating process must encompass all types of nuclear weapons - missiles, aircraft and naval forces - and must involve all the nuclear Powers.

A gradual and all-embracing reduction of nuclear weapons, naturally including a ban on nuclear tests, the establishment of more denuclearized zones and a strengthening of the non-proliferation regime, would, with wide-ranging measures to promote confidence and openness, lead to the strengthening of international security and eliminate the threat of a catastrophic nuclear war.

The rapidity of positive changes in Europe shows that processes which previously seemed inconceivable can become reality if their time has come and if the countries concerned have the political will. It appears that even total nuclear disarmament may be less remote than some think today.

There are difficult problems underlying the agenda item on the role of science and technology in the framework of international security and disarmament and other related fields. Today, when science and technology are developing very rapidly in various fields, their military application could have unforeseeable consequences. Therefore, curbing the qualitative arms race and ensuring more predictability concerning how matters will develop in the military-technical field could play an important role in strengthening confidence and allaying fears of possible destabilization. In this connection, a useful role could be played by the exchange of agreed information on actual or planned military research, the monitoring of scientific and technological advances and the assessment of new technology from the standpoint of its possible use for military purposes. We believe that the Secretary-General's report entitled "Scientific and technological

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

developments and their impact on international security" (A/45/568) is very important in this regard. In particular, the criteria proposed in the Secretary-General's report for the assessment of new technologies could very well play an important role in the Commission's discussion of these matters.

We must also bear in mind the possibilities of science and technology in disarmament, such as the use of new scientific and technical discoveries in connection with verification and the fulfilment of agreements, the monitoring of armaments and disarmament and means of eliminating or converting weapons. Here too, the organization of an appropriate exchange of information about relevant scientific and technological developments is very important.

Regional aspects play a large role, perhaps a key role, in the global context of international peace and security. In many recent cases, progress towards settling conflicts and acute situations has been made chiefly at the regional level. Examples are Central America, South-East Asia and the conflict situation in Angola. In addition, of course, the most remarkable results were achieved in Europe. Many fundamental documents worked out within the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe are, as I have pointed out, the foundation of a new model of security on the continent, based on interaction between States in the political, military, humanitarian, economic, ecological and other fields. The experience of "building Europe" must be at the centre of the Commission's attention; obviously that valuable experience can be profitably used in other regions with due regard for local conditions.

Subregional and bilateral measures can also play an important part in the regional approach to disarmament. There are instances in which measures that are to be included in regional or even wider agreements have first been agreed upon and "smoothed out" on a bilateral or subregional basis. One good example

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

is a series of bilateral training inspections with regard to chemical weapons conducted before the conclusion of an all-embracing international convention prohibiting chemical weapons, and in fact designed to facilitate its early conclusion. There have been similar examples in connection with the monitoring of nuclear tests and with some other disarmament problems. With appropriate improvements, such regional, subregional or bilateral measures could be useful in other fields as well, especially as regards monitoring, verification and confidence-building measures.

(Mr. Oudovenko, Ukrainian SSR)

In the sphere of strengthening international security and disarmament there has been in recent years increased development of confidence-building measures; in that connection military openness, the exchange of objective military information, is very important. This is also reflected in the growing number of States providing data on military expenditures, using the United Nations standardized system of reporting. Last year's discussion on the problem of military information laid a good foundation for direct work on an appropriate document on that subject. The Commission's examination of the purposes, principles and machinery of openness in military information could be most useful in the strengthening of mutual trust and security. In this area too, we believe, regional and subregional aspects must not be forgotten.

Thus, our renewed Disarmament Commission will make its contribution to the move towards radically new principles for ensuring international security, further reducing military capabilities and developing mutual trust and understanding among States. We expect the Commission to achieve success in that endeavour.

The CHAIRMAN: Before calling on the next speaker, I wish, on behalf of the members of the Disarmament Commission, to express deep condolences to the delegations of Costa Rica and Panama on the catastrophic earthquake that has struck the area. I assure both delegations that members of the Commission feel deep compassion in connection with this catastrophe.

Miss RIVERA (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish): At the outset, Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your kind words addressed to the people of Costa Rica.

On behalf of the Costa Rican delegation let me thank you, Sir, on your election to the chairmanship of this important body, the Disarmament

(Miss Rivera, Costa Rica)

Commission. We are sure that your personal qualities, your experience and your perseverence will guarantee the success of our work. It gives me pleasure also to congratulate the other Commission officers.

This session of the Disarmament Commission is taking place in a climate that favours reaching a new stage in genuine disarmament. Changes in the international situation, such as perestroika and glasnost in the Soviet Union, the unification of Germany and, more recently, the formal dissolution of the Warsaw Pact as of 1992, have closed the chapter of contemporary history known as the cold war. This has unquestionably encouraged the super-Powers to make joint efforts to promote disarmament in Europe. The Persian Gulf crisis darkened the world scene, but it made us consider the consequences of international arms transfers and their inevitable impact on mankind and the environment. For that reason the super-Powers have recently tried to slow the arms race in the Gulf.

A result of this new world situation is the talk of the creation of a new international order which we hope will be more just and will lead to a more effective process of disarmament. That process can succeed only with the cooperation and active participation of all nations, from the greatest to the smallest.

My delegation attaches importance to all the substantive matters on the Commission's agenda, but we are particularly interested in the following items: "Regional approach to disarmament within the context of global security" and related areas; and "Objective information on military matters" and the relationship between international security and disarmament.

Last year the General Assembly adopted resolution 45/58 M, on regional disarmament, including confidence-building measures, of which Costa Rica was a

(Miss Rivera, Costa Rica)

sponsor in the First Committee. My delegation is convinced of the need to hasten regional disarmament, which is a fundamental element of world efforts for peace.

My country endorses the fifth preambular paragraph of that resolution, which recognizes the importance of regional disarmament measures taken at the initiative and with the participation of all States concerned and taking into account the specific characteristics of each region, in that they can contribute to universal security and stability, in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

Similarly, we stress the importance of efforts by countries to achieve regional disarmament in conformity with the principle of reasonable security, reducing to the lowest possible level armed forces and weapons, which would unquestionably make available to countries vast resources for economic and social development.

Central America, where my country is situated, is a fine example of such efforts to achieve regional disarmament. Our region took the direct path to the solution of the crisis by creating the Esquipulas process, which is one link in the long chain of efforts that began in 1982 and that continues with the efforts of Costa Rica and other Central American Governments.

Following up on this process, our President, Mr. Rafael Angel Calderon Fournier, and the President of Nicaragua, Mrs. Violeta Barrios de Chamorro, in a joint declaration signed by both countries on 30 January 1991, have indicated their Governments' determination to promote the demilitarization of Central America.

We are aware of the difficulties involved in this challenge, but the challenge is most timely and demands due attention. That is why Costa Rica

(Miss Rivera, Costa Rica)

supports and underscores the progress in the Central American security commission's negotiations on a Central American agreement on security, verification, the control and limitation of weapons and military personnel, and on the activities of the United Nations Observer Group in Central America (ONUCA).

We also support the request to ONUCA made in the statement on the situation in El Salvador to investigate the origin of the weapons used in the most recent offensive by the FMLN, and to promote the achievement of a peaceful solution to the conflict to put an end to all military assistance.

There is no doubt that recent conflicts have resulted from the real effects of the transfer of arms to areas beset by tension and conflict. That is why we must give our attention to the problem of international arms transfers. The entire question of weapons transfers - commercial or non-commercial, legal or illegal - is to be viewed in that context and as a part of the arms race. It grows ever more obvious that this problem poses a threat to security, not only national and regional security but also international security, and that it exacerbates regional conflicts.

(Miss Rivera, Costa Rica)

My mission urges both the super-Powers and those negotiating with them in the area of the arms race to become aware of this problem, to show good will and profound respect for human rights, to reduce their arms levels both quantitatively and qualitatively and to publish reports on progress along these lines, all in an effort to adopt confidence-building measures and to promote regional peace.

In order to further the peace process and to meet the commitments entered into in the Puntarenas Declaration, my country recognizes the urgent need to promote education for peace. The creation of a clear awareness of the destructiveness of weapons and acts of war must be encouraged as part of the curriculum of elementary and secondary schools and universities so that young people learn to solve problems by peaceful means. This, after all, would only be in keeping with the Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in its preamble:

> "since wars began in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed".

In this way, we would be promoting the goal set forth in the Final Document of the tenth special session of the General Assembly, in which

> "Governments and governmental and non-governmental international organizations are urged to take steps to develop programmes of education for disarmament and peace studies at all levels." (Resolution S-10/2, para. 106)

We believe that, in order to achieve this end, the Secretary-General should be asked to put into effect a plan co-ordinated by the Department for Disarmament Affairs with the collaboration of UNESCO, aimed at intensifying

(Miss Rivera, Costa Rica)

efforts to design and implement programmes of education for disarmament and peace.

We are convinced that such vital objectives as those set forth in the World Disarmament Campaign, namely, to inform, educate and create general understanding and support for the objectives of the United Nations in the field of arms limitation and disarmament, would all help to achieve the goal we are pursuing. That is why the General Assembly has promoted education for disarmament and peace, both in the First Committee and in the Disarmament Commission, and proclaimed the 1990s as the Third Disarmament Decade.

Lastly, my delegation believes that education on international peace and security issues would play a fundamental part in allowing every individual to realize his or her role as a responsible member of the world community.

Mr. MARKER (Pakistan): May I at the very outset, Sir, say how happy we are to see you, the representative of a country with which Pakistan maintains very friendly relations, presiding over the Disarmament Commission. Your rich diplomatic experience makes us confident that, under your wise and able guidance, the work of the Commission will be conducted in a most efficient and successful manner. I would like to assure you, Sir, of our fullest cooperation and support in the fulfillment of your important responsibilities.

In a rapidly evolving global situation, this year's session of the Disarmament Commission has assumed even greater importance. We have witnessed the end of the cold war and the growth of a new spirit of cooperation and understanding as the two major nuclear Powers continue their disarmament negotiations, giving rise to renewed hope and expectations. In

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

Europe we have witnessed the success of regional initiatives in the process of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). Yet against this backdrop of significant changes, there has been a recrudescence of tensions as a result of regional problems which have remained unresolved over a long period.

An important dimension of the global security environment lies in the danger posed to the security of smaller States by the militarization and aggressive postures of larger States, aimed at exercizing regional domination and hegemony. This is mainly a result of various factors, which include the history of past tensions based on unresolved territorial disputes, denial of the right of self-determination, ambitions of regional hegemony by the militarily most powerful States, foreign occupation and military intervention.

While a global response to disarmament is most commendable, a collective endeavour by countries at the regional level to promote disarmament and to enhance security at the lowest possible level of armaments is an indispensable corollary to their advocacy of global disarmament. We are of the firm belief that a regional approach would effectively promote nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament and would strengthen the security of smaller States, thus contributing to international peace and security. The global and regional approaches to disarmament complement each other and can therefore be pursued simultaneously.

There is a growing recognition that the security problems and preoccupations of States can be accorded fuller consideration in a regional framework, where remedial measures, which are suitable to specific situations, can be designed. In this context, I refer to the agreements signed between my country and India: (1) on advance notice on military exercises, manoeuvres

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

and troop movements; (2) on prevention of air space violations and permission for overflights and landings of military aircraft; and (3) not to attack each other's nuclear facilities. These are small yet significant confidence-building measures, which we hope will lead to other similar steps in future.

The importance of the regional approach has been clearly recognized by the inclusion of the item entitled, "Regional approach to disarmament within the context of global security" on this year's agenda of the Disarmament Commission. My delegation looks forward to participating actively in the deliberations on this item. In this connection, we call attention to our resolution 45/58 (P) on regional disarmament adopted by the forty-fifth session of the General Assembly, wherein the General Assembly has called upon States to conclude agreements, wherever possible, for nuclear non-proliferation, disarmament and confidence-building measures at the regional and sub-regional levels.

The question of a nuclear test ban continues to remain on the disarmament agenda as one of the most pressing items. It has been widely recognized that a comprehensive test ban treaty is an essential prerequisite to non-proliferaton. It would end the development of more devastating nuclear weapons and, most of all, obviate the possibility of their spread to non-nuclear-weapon States. It is therefore somewhat ironical that those very countries which have been advocating the cause of non-proliferation so vociferously, and which have cast doubts and aspersions on the peaceful nature of the nuclear programmes of others, continue to create obstacles in the way of a comprehensive test ban treaty.

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

I should like to take this opportunity to reiterate once again Pakistan's commitment, at the highest level, to non-proliferation. We have, at the global level, attached utmost importance to the early conclusion of a nuclear test ban, with the ultimate objective of removing nuclear weapons from the face of the Earth and preventing nuclear proliferation. At the regional level, we have welcomed the initiatives, like the establishment of nuclear-weapons-free zones, to keep various regions free of nuclear weapons.

Pakistan has welcomed the recent agreement signed by Argentina and Brazil to protect their region from the risk of the introduction of nuclear weapons, and to promote the creation of an atmosphere of growing mututal trust in the nuclear field. This is a particularly auspicious development as it lends greater credence to our own proposal for nuclear non-proliferation in South Asia. Argentina and Brazil have indeed set an example which needs to be emulated in other parts of the world.

We ourselves have taken a number of initiatives designed to keep our region free of nuclear weapons and to promote mutual confidence among the countries of the region about each other's nuclear programmes. These initiatives include our proposal for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, which has been endorsed repeatedly by the General Assembly since 1974, and the convening of a conference on nuclear non-proliferation in South Asia under the auspices of the United Nations. We also remain ready to make a joint declaration with India renouncing the acquisition or manufacture of nuclear weapons; to conclude a bilateral agreement with India for the mutual inspection of each other's nuclear facilities; to accede to the non-proliferation Treaty simultaneously with India; to accept International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards on our

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

nuclear programme simultaneously with India; and to enter into a regional nuclear test-ban treaty in South Asia, or a bilateral nuclear test-ban treaty with India.

The growing recognition of the regional dimensions of the nuclear problem is reflected in the increased support the idea of regional solutions has found recently both inside and outside the United Nations. At the beginning of this year we ratified our agreement signed earlier with India not to attack each other's nuclear facilities. We hope that this will pave the way for other, similar steps in the future.

We have consistently expressed deep concern over the threat posed to non-nuclear-weapon States by the nuclear arsenals of nuclear-weapons States. The most effective assurance against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons would be their complete elimination. However, until this objective is achieved the non-nuclear-weapons States must be provided with credible and legally binding guarantees against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Such assurances are necessary to enhance the sense of security in non-nuclear-weapon States. The slow pace of negotiations on nuclear disarmament makes such assurances even more imperative.

The escalation in the naval arms and armaments of some countries, in terms both of quality and of quantity, beyond the legitimate requirements of coastal defence has induced an element of concern and insecurity among smaller States. The expansion and modernization of naval forces, combined with the increased sophistication of sea-based weapon systems, the deployment at sea of nuclear weapons, both strategic and tactical, and the introduction of nuclear-powered submarines in different regions of the world, has given an alarming multiplier capability to the navies of a few States. Consequently,

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

the security of small and medium-sized coastal States is now threatened from the sea on an unprecedented scale. The question of naval disarmament and the imposition of the restrictions on the military uses of the high seas therefore deserves to be addressed urgently.

Pakistan supports all efforts aimed at ensuring the equal and undiminished security of States at the lowest level of armaments and military expenditure. We also support efforts to ban the illegal transfer of arms and arms sales to drug barons and terrorist mercenaries.

It must, however, be recognized that every country has the sovereign right to determine its own legitimate defence needs. The arms-exporting countries cannot assume this right as regards the arms-importing countries or non-weapon-producing countries. The question of arms transfers should therefore be considered within the overall context of conventional arms control. We must bear in mind the other inseparable and integrally linked aspects of the question, particularly the indigenous defence production capabilities of different States as well as the legitimate security concerns of all.

Many small and medium-sized States, lacking indigenous defence production capabilities, have no choice but to rely upon international transfers of arms to meet their essential security needs. In some cases, they perceive threats to their security emanating from States with larger indigenous defence production capabilities. Obviously, denying such small and medium-sized States the possibility of acquisition of arms through international transfers would endanger their security and thus have a destabilizing effect on international peace and security.

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

The international community must therefore guard against any attempts to isolate and highlight only one aspect of conventional arms control while ignoring these other important aspects.

In our view, collection of information on military matters concerning all States - that is, the nuclear-weapon States; the large, militarily significant States; and the small, militarily weaker States - would create some problems for the smaller States. In our view making information on military matters available through an international reporting system may work against the security interests of the smaller States. While these States would not acquire any benefit on account of the information they received regarding the military capability of the bigger States, the same information concerning the smaller States could be used to their disadvantage by the bigger States seeking regional and global hegemony and influence.

The Disarmament Commission has been examining the question of military budgets since 1979. Efforts have been made over the past years to evolve a set of principles which would govern the actions by States to freeze and reduce military budgets.

In our view, the adoption of arbitrary criteria to freeze or cut military spending, without addressing the security anxieties of the States concerned, is not realistic. The recommendations evolved by the Disarmament Commission must, in particular, give due consideration to the security concerns of small developing and non-aligned States and their regional security perspectives.

The wide disparity between the armaments expenditure of militarily strong States and that of the other countries cannot be justified. The reduction in military budgets therefore should be initiated by those States which possess massive military arsenals.

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

Science and technology is the common asset of mankind and should be commonly shared. There should be a free flow of scientific knowledge. A more concerted effort to stimulate growth and improve the quality of life of the developing countries would not be possible without adequate recourse to science and technology.

The developing countries are confronted with increasing resistance from some States in their efforts to obtain technology for the development and advancement of their peaceful nuclear energy programmes. The General Assembly, through its resolution 32/50, has categorically affirmed that

> "All States have the right, in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality, to develop their programmes for the peaceful uses of nuclear technology for economic and social development, in conformity with their priorities, interests and needs." (resolution 32/50, para. 1 (b))

The resolution also clearly states that

> "All States, without discrimination, should have access to and should be free to acquire nuclear technology, equipment and materials for the peaceful use of nuclear energy." (ibid., para. 1 (c))

Pakistan believes that all States Members of the United Nations should abide by these principles, in order to check and reverse the negative trends impeding cooperation in the field of peaceful nuclear energy.

The relationship between disarmament and development has been the subject of intense study over the past few years. In fact, a major conference on the subject took place a few years ago. Discussions on this issue have clearly underlined the need to divert resources, funds and technologies released

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

through disarmament to social and economic development, including environmental protection, particularly in the developing countries. In our view, therefore, these valuable resources should be used equitably and in the best possible manner and should not be concentrated on only one aspect to the detriment of others.

(Mr. Marker, Pakistan)

The relationship between disarmament and development has been clearly established and recognized by the United Nations. The recommendations adopted at the special session of the General Assembly on the relationship between disarmament and development have unfortunately not been implemented. It is a sad reflection on mankind that more money is being spent on armaments each year while the developing countries continue to struggle with their international debt problems.

The futility of unbridled arms races has been demonstrated to us time and again. It is imperative that we learn these lessons of history, particularly in this day and age when we possess weapons of horrifying destructive capability. Many years ago, the sage Abu Talib said:

"if a man fires at the past from a pistol, the future will fire at him from a cannon".

Today, as we stand possessed of weapons which could destroy the entire planet in a matter of hours, these words of wisdom carry a truth which is as significant as it is ominous.

Mr. DONOWAKI (Japan): First of all, my delegation wishes to join with others in congratulating you on your assumption of the very important post of Chairman of this Commission, in the very important first year after the reform. Your rich and vast experience, and your well-known, recognized skill in chairing meetings will certainly ensure that we will be able to carry out our deliberations during this session very successfully and fruitfully.

My delegation also wishes to express its appreciation to the previous Chairman of the Commission, Ambassador Sutresna, for his work last year and for the consultations he conducted leading to the successful preparations for the reform, which started this year.

(Mr. Donowaki, Japan)

As we all may recall, the historic developments that resulted in the alleviation of East-West rivalry and the cold war gave rise to high expectations among all nations that a new world order based on cooperation rather than on confrontation might become a prevailing factor in our international dealings. However, the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, in violation of international law and order, made us realize that, even after the ending of the cold war, international peace and security could not be guaranteed by high expectations alone, but that what was really needed was a series of specific measures, within the framework of the United Nations, taken by the Member States.

Also, when we heard people talk about the delay in the ratification of the Treaty on conventional armed forces in Europe (CFE) and the delay in concluding the START negotiations, we were made to realize that the much-awaited process of change in the Soviet Union and the democratization of the eastern European States, as well as the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe process, including the signing of the CFE Treaty, could not be as rosy and as easy as might have been expected.

Therefore, it is the earnest wish of Japan that all the States Members of the United Nations, including the two super-Powers, make determined efforts to promote the cause of arms control and disarmament, taking into account the full significance of the ending of the cold war.

It was in order to adapt to these changes in today's world that the Disarmament Commission last year concluded its deliberations on all its long-standing agenda items and decided to reorient its work, as from this year, under the four new and streamlined agenda items. As I stated last year, the most important and substantial function of the Disarmament Commission

(Mr. Donowaki, Japan)

should be to develop common understanding among all the participating States, including those other than Conference on Disarmament member States, through in-depth deliberation of various specific issues of disarmament. In order to enhance the role of the Disarmament Commission as a deliberative body, continued and even more active participation in the work of this Commission by States other than Conference on Disarmament member States would certainly be highly desirable.

As to the subject matters covered by the four agenda items, my delegation intends to make an active contribution during the course of the debates in the various working groups. Accordingly, in this general debate, I wish to confine myself to a brief explanation of the basic position of my Government on each of the subject matters covered by the agenda items.

The agenda items cover some of the old issues of disarmament as well as new ones, but each one of them represents critical challenges which we are facing today at this time of transition. The position of my Government on these issues may be of some interest to other delegations.

First, as to the question of objective information on military matters, Japan has been trying to enhance the openness and transparency of its defence capabilities to a remarkable extent, by the annual issuance of white papers on national defence and also by other means. In this way, Japan has contributed to the reduction of tension in the Asia-Pacific region.

The European experience of the CFE Treaty and negotiations on confidence- and security-building measures might not be immediately applicable to other regions where geopolitical, strategic and historical conditions might not be the same as in Europe. However, as a first step, if the nations in these regions were to make available, voluntarily, as much objective information on

(Mr. Donowaki, Japan)

military matters as possible, that step would certainly play a useful role in reducing tension in these regions. Of course, détente in its true sense would not be achievable unless the political issues in the regions concerned were solved, and undue emphasis on the exchange of military information which is neither verifiable nor concrete and comparable under circumstances where political issues remain unsolved might bring about a situation contrary to what objective information on military matters is meant to achieve.

My delegation therefore hopes that this year's Disarmament Commission session will seriously discuss the question of what suitable areas and types of information there are to be exchanged in order best to contribute to the reduction of tension in the regions concerned.

Also, my Government takes the view that the question of how to enhance openness and transparency in arms transfers ought to be taken up as one of the important subjects to be dealt with under this agenda item. As we are all aware, the harmful effects of international arms transfers have become a focal point of attention during the course of the recent Gulf crisis. This question is also being addressed by a group of experts under United Nations auspices.

The Disarmament Commission might do well to take up this question from the viewpoint of determining whether or not it is possible to establish, within the framework of the United Nations, a standardized reporting system for international arms transfers, and also from the viewpoint of determining what possibilities there are for improving and strengthening administrative and legal mechanisms for self-restraint on exports of conventional arms by each of the States Members of the United Nations. In this respect, Japan has

(Mr. Donowaki, Japan)

for more than 20 years maintained a policy of strict control over arms exports, refraining, under the three principles of arms exports, from exporting arms, and will abide by this policy for the foreseeable future.

(Mr. Donowaki, Japan)

As to the second agenda item on nuclear disarmament, in spite of the drastic changes in East-West relations the maintenance of international peace and security continues to be based upon the balance of military strength, including nuclear deterrence. Accordingly, what is required of us in our endeavour to pursue nuclear disarmament is the continuation of step-by-step efforts to realize ever-lower levels of the power balance without jeopardizing the security of nations concerned. In making such efforts for nuclear disarmament, we will have to devote ourselves to the three main areas of the reduction of nuclear arms, the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, and a nuclear-test ban.

In the field of the reduction of nuclear arms, the START negotiation aiming to achieve a substantial reduction of strategic nuclear weapons is no doubt of historic importance, although the negotiation now appears to be lagging somewhat behind. It is the expectation of the entire world that the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union will exert their utmost efforts for a successful conclusion of the negotiation. Its failure would constitute a major set-back not only in United States-Soviet bilateral relations but also in post-cold-war international relations in general, and this would not serve the interests of the two super-Powers either. Therefore, Japan strongly hopes that determined efforts will be made for an early conclusion of the START treaty and that the START II negotiations will be launched.

With respect to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, the Fourth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons of last September ended without being able to adopt its final declaration, despite the great efforts made by delegations going through sessions night after night. In view of the upcoming 1995 extension conference

(Mr. Donowaki, Japan)

of the non-proliferation Treaty, one can never overemphasize the importance of the Treaty, which offers the basis for the non-proliferation régime as well as the framework for the promotion of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Japan wholeheartedly supports the extension of the Treaty, and believes that all the States Parties, irrespective of whether they are nuclear-weapon States or not, should make constructive and sincere efforts in order to ensure the extension of the Treaty. Furthermore, for the purpose of strengthening the non-proliferation régime, efforts will also have to be made in search of more effective export control of missile-related technology, and in search of a more effective safeguard mechanism of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

With respect to the question of a nuclear-test ban, the coming into force of the Treaty on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Weapon Tests and the Treaty on Underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes, together with their Verification Protocols, was a truly encouraging event. Japan hopes that the United States and the Soviet Union will proceeed to the next stage of further limiting nuclear testing as early as possible, without losing momentum. In the multilateral scene, added efforts will have to be made in view of the useful discussions that took place at the Amendment Conference to the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water earlier this year. The re-establishment of the Nuclear-Test Ban Ad Hoc Committee again this year in the Conference on Disarmament was certainly a step forward in this direction. The extremely lively discussions initiated in the Ad Hoc Committee, under the able chairmanship of Ambassador Chadha of India, might be seen as the beginning of a genuine dialogue between the nuclear-weapon States and the non-nuclear-weapon States,

(Mr. Donowaki, Japan)

a dialogue Japan has long been advocating. Japan earnestly hopes that such a dialogue will lead to joint and cooperative efforts in finding ways to solve the problem.

As for the agenda item on a regional approach to disarmament in a global context, characteristics specific to regions - as I pointed out earlier when I dealt with the question of objective information on military matters - will have to be taken into account even more carefully. Also, I should like to recall the Regional Meeting on Confidence-Building Measures in the Asia-Pacific Region organized by the Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific of the United Nations in Kathmandu in January. This was the second such meeting following last year's. The meeting was attended by Government officials and experts from throughout the region, and succeeded in no small measure in promoting mutual understanding on various problems of the region. However, as I stated earlier, the settlement of political issues will continue to be the prerequisite condition for the promotion of genuine confidence-building measures in the Asian-Pacific region.

In this connection, the much-talked-about transfer to the east of the Urals of conventional weapons, which were agreed to be reduced under the Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe, will result in strengthening conventional armed forces in the Asian region and will not only damage confidence among Asian nations but also unnecessarily heighten tension in that region. This cannot be the right approach to our agenda item on "Regional approach to disarmament within the context of global security", and a more constructive approach that would be welcomed by the nations of the region would have to be sought. On the other hand, the recent agreement between the leaders of Brazil and Argentina on cooperation in the field of the peaceful

(Mr. Donowaki, Japan)

uses of nuclear energy should be welcomed as an exemplary model for regional confidence building, and Japan regards highly the steps taken by the two nations.

As for the contribution being made by Japan in this field, I should like to reiterate the fact that, under its Peace Constitution, Japan strictly abides by its policies of maintaining exclusively defensive forces and of not becoming a military Power threatening to other nations. In line with these policies, Japan firmly upholds its security arrangements with the United States; abides by its three non-nuclear principles of not possessing, not producing, and not allowing the entry of nuclear weapons; and has kept its defence capabilities to the minimum required for self-defence purposes. These basic policies of Japan, together with the policy of openness about its defence capabilities, as well as the policy of strict control on arms exports, should serve as contributing factors to the security of the region and of the world.

With respect to the agenda item on the role of science and technology, the Sendai Conference of April last year organized by the United Nations Department for Disarmament Affairs is still fresh in our memories. In today's world, where a nation's security is closely interwoven with international security, the far-reaching impact of the development and transfer of science and technology on security matters cannot be underestimated. There will be a greater need for strict control of the transfer of technologies, raw materials and equipment related to weapons of mass destruction, such as nuclear weapons, as well as chemical and biological weapons.

At the same time, the dualistic character of science and technology will have to be taken into account in order not to restrict their availability, as they are otherwise useful for the welfare and prosperity of the world. In

(Mr. Donowaki, Japan)

this connection, due attention will have to be paid to the importance of ethical awareness and a sense of responsibility on the part of those who are engaged in scientific and technological activities. In addition, the role of science and technology in promoting arms control and disarmament through further development of verification technologies will have to be recognized. I should like to add that Japan is willing to make contributions in this field.

Each of the four agenda items on which I have just stated the basic position of my Government represents important areas of problems. The current session of the Disarmament Commission certainly will not be enough to draw conclusions on them. Various international forums other than the Disarmament Commission might also be encouraged to conduct an exchange of views on the manifold aspects of these problems.

It was from such a viewpoint that Japan recently took the initiative to host a United Nations conference dealing with disarmament issues. The conference, which will be held in Kyoto at the end of May, will be attended by about 100 leading Government officials and intellectuals from about 30 to 40 nations, and will discuss post-Gulf-crisis disarmament and arms-control issues in the context of the post-cold-war situation.

(Mr. Donowaki, Japan)

Such questions as the international transfer of conventional arms and the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, of whose importance we have been reminded as a result of the Gulf crisis, will be taken up at the Kyoto Conference, and it my Government's expectation that a lively and meaningful exchange of views will take place among the Conference's participants, which, in turn, should contribute to the deliberation of those issues in the various United Nations forums.

Mr. KHARRAZI (Islamic Republic of Iran): At the outset I would like, on behalf of my delegation and on my own behalf, to express my sincere congratulations to you, Sir, on your election as Chairman of the Disarmament Commission. We are confident that your long experience in international affairs and your valuable and unique knowledge of multilateral diplomacy and disarmament issues will effectively guide the Disarmament Commission towards achieving concrete results at this significant session. I wish to assure you of my delegation's full support as you undertake your responsibilities as Chairman. I should like, in addition, to take this opportunity to thank your predecessor, Ambassador Sutresna, the Permanent Representative of Indonesia, who so ably guided the difficult deliberations of the Disarmament Commission last year.

The Disarmament Commission begins its 1991 substantive session at a time when both a growing sense of hope and an abiding anxiety prevail in international relations. The new international milieu should give a decisive impetus to international forums, and particularly to those that address issues of international security, arms control and disarmament to promote and accelerate genuine progress towards the realization of global security and disarmament. In this connection we hope that certain changes being introduced

(Mr. Kharrazi, Islamic Republic of Iran)

in the working methods of the Disarmament Commission as of this session - that is, confining the Commission's deliberations to four substantive items - could in themselves contribute to enhancing this deliberative body's role in addressing significant issues relating to the cause of peace, security and general and complete disarmament.

Over the past several years fundamental developments in East-West relations, specifically between the two major Powers, have had a positive impact in the area of arms control and disarmament. The risks posed by a possible outbreak of nuclear war have been practically diminished. In Europe, one of the major arenas of world affairs, important changes designed to reverse the arms race, reduce the concentration of various types of weapons and create appropriate conditions for peaceful coexistence among States have marked the conclusion of the negotiations within the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. However, despite those significant developments, in large parts of the globe, including the region of the Middle East, a potentially precarious situation continues to threaten both regional and international peace and security.

Although the war in our region appears to be over, the basic issues that relate to the very security of the Persian Gulf region remain unresolved. The recent developments in our region have once again given clear proof that there is a great danger in concentrating sophisticated arms and weapons of mass destruction in that area. It is evident, however, that the erroneous policies of certain major Powers, which are based on pumping up demands for arms and the transfer of weapons to the volatile region of the Persian Gulf, continue to be pursued. In this context it is regrettable to note that the United States Administration has very recently decided to sell sophisticated weapons

(Mr. Kharrazi, Islamic Republic of Iran)

worth billions of dollars to a number of countries in the region. This erroneous approach, together with the presence of foreign forces in the Persian Gulf area, is inherently destabilizing. It is worth pointing out that, in contrast to the international community's attitude with regard to the first aggression in the Persian Gulf region, which was initiated against my country, the second aggression has given rise to a sense of the urgent need to control the transfer of arms to the region.

The piling up of new types of destructive weaponry is not the proper instrumentality for securing a viable peace and security in the Persian Gulf region. The urgent need is to develop a new way of thinking, to establish and strengthen confidence-building measures and to shape a new form of cooperation among littoral States in the area. It is our deep conviction that anything short of the establishment of a true regional security and cooperation arrangement, without the interference of foreign Powers, will not serve the real interests of countries in the region in the long-term stability of that strategic area. We have repeatedly emphasized that any genuine security and cooperation agreement in the Persian Gulf should encompass all the countries of the region whose religious, cultural and economic bonds provide the fundamental incentives for solidarity amongst themselves. The region's long-term security and stability demand that all the countries in the Persian Gulf make every effort to realize this noble goal. My country's long-standing support for the establishment of a regional security arrangement in the area clearly demonstrates our commitment to this end, which is consistent with our initiatives and pledges to promote and strengthen regional peace and security. Such an arrangement would not only enhance respect for the principles of international law enshrined in the United Nations Charter -

(Mr. Kharrazi, Islamic Republic of Iran)

including the peaceful settlement of disputes, the refraining from the use or threast of use of force and the inviolability of internationally recognized boundaries - but also reverse the trend of the arms race in the region and pave the way for the expansion of relations in all aspects among the littoral States in the Persian Gulf.

I have tried to outline matters that we consider to be of paramount importance in the context of the disarmament agenda before us, namely, agenda item 3, "Regional approach to disarmament within the context of global security." I am confident that in its consideration of that item the Commission will also be mindful of the concerns I have presented today.

(Mr. Kharrazi, Islamic Republic of Iran)

It has often been underlined that the scourge of nuclear weapons continues to menace the very existence of present and succeeding generations. The realization of the objectives of the Disarmament Commission's second substantive agenda item, "Process of nuclear disarmament", would not only diminish the tremendous dangers stemming from nuclear weapons, but would also greatly enhance international peace and security. In the post-cold-war era the international community looks forward earnestly to considering how the performance of nuclear-weapons Powers will affect the cause of nuclear disarmament. The grave responsibilities resting on nuclear-power States in this regard cannot be overemphasized. It is incumbent upon these States, however, to address effectively and constructively the various critical issues relating to the nuclear disarmament agenda.

The international community has emphatically reiterated the point that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones would contribute to eliminating increased incentives to acquire nuclear weapons, particularly in regions which are hotbeds of tension, like the Middle East. My country, which proposed to the General Assembly in 1974 the establishment of such a zone for the Middle East, believes that current circumstances in our region make it all the more imperative that every effort be directed towards the establishment of a zone free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East. There is no need to emphasize that in this context it is important - aside from an immediate need to assure the security of non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of the use of nuclear weapons, through a strict, legally binding instrument, and to offset the failures and shortcomings of the non-proliferation Treaty, including shortcomings with

(Mr. Kharrazi, Islamic Republic of Iran)

regard to its universality - to place all the nuclear facilities of the region under the International Atomic Energy Agency's verification system.

In conclusion, I wish to point out that we shall have an occasion to address the other substantive agenda items of this session at a later stage.

Mr. GARCIA MORITAN (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): I wish first, Mr. Chairman, to say how pleased my delegation is to see you presiding over the Commission's deliberations at a time that is particularly important for our body, because we are beginning what could be called a new stage in our work. We are convinced that your diplomatic skills and your well-known qualities of leadership will help us have fruitful consideration of a particularly heavy agenda.

We wish also to express our appreciation to Ambassador Nana Sutresna of Indonesia, your predecessor, and to congratulate the other officers of the Commission and the Chairmen of the Working Groups. I do not believe we could be in better hands.

I should also like to express my delegation's thanks to the Secretary of the Commission, Mr. Lin, and the other members of the Secretariat for their invaluable assistance to our work. I am well aware of the work they do, because last year I was responsible for a Group, and without the assistance of Mr. Lin and Miss Marcaillou the results would not have been the same. I wish therefore to express my admiration to Mr. Akashi for the way in which he is conducting his Department's affairs.

I cannot complete this ritual of sincere expressions of thanks without saying that we are very happy to see the Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament attending our deliberations. We continue to see the work of

(Mr. Garcia Moritan, Argentina)

our Commission as a process of deliberation and debate. Subjects are dealt with here before they go to the sole disarmament negotiating forum, the Conference on Disarmament - and it is indeed Ambassador Komatina who is its Secretary-General.

Since our last meeting we have left behind an agenda that coexisted with a climate of confrontation and ended in an international scene that at times seemed kaleidoscopic. At the level of international politics unusual and attractive new patterns now appear before us. Unexpected designs follow one another swiftly before our eyes, before coming together again in a new pattern. Earlier shapes are forgotten in the presence of a new reality. Movement seems to be the rule.

Maybe this visual metaphor will serve to describe a feeling that, I am convinced, we have all experienced at one time or another, faced with the changes and situations we have witnessed in the recent past. Obviously, serious questions are raised, but it is clear that we also have a number of important certainties.

One is the firm defence of certain basic principles of international life embodied in the Charter of the United Nations, as was the case when diplomacy was silent over the illegitimate annexation of a sovereign State. Another certainty, related to the spirit I have described, suggests, for instance, that in a world where issues of a global nature are ever more numerous and significant, there is no longer a place for attitudes that do not take into account collective needs.

A political framework such as the one now taking shape implies that all States, without exception, have a responsibility to place their creativity at

(Mr. Garcia Moritan, Argentina)

the service of global solutions in all areas. Strengthening the multilateral system is thus a fundamental requirement to ensure the development of an international community capable of reducing the social, economic and technological imbalances that persist to this day.

We are encouraged in our search for comprehensive solutions by the possibility of reaching agreements on international problems more easily than in the past. As regards our new agenda, this suggests the challenge of defining renewed concepts. The possibility of encouraging a world of cooperation and convergence, which will leave behind for ever the unmistakable imprint of mistrust of the second post-war period, is opening up before us.

My region is still making its customary contribution today. A common perception of the historical times we were living in generated a climate that was conducive to new, deep understandings. Military analysts and observers know very well that in terms of military spending Latin America is the region with the least weapons in the world. This has not prevented us from developing a wide range of initiatives in the area of security in order to confirm that reality, to deepen it and, above all, to lay the foundations of an America generously devoted to cooperation and regional integration.

(Mr. Garcia Moritan, Argentina)

In the huge effort finally to leave behind economic stagnation and to devote all our resources to production, we give due priority to scientific and technological programmes. In that context, and aware of the legitimate concerns to which dual-purpose technologies can give rise, we adopt an open and transparent approach in the development of those programmes and in the transfer of high technology. The broad process of integration with Brazil and its extension to other countries of the subregion shows that it is possible to reconcile the indispensible possession of high technology with the existence of a stable, predictable regional framework free of suspicion as regards security.

Time and history have presented us with the unexpected opportunity to live in a world marked by growing interdependence and integration. Economic and industrial factors and the transnational effects of technology are weaving a network of mutual interests and confidence-building measures that enable us to approach the political problems involved on a different basis.

This requires a clear international consensus in key areas. In science and technology we consider it necessary to replace oligopoly and censorship with policies more in tune with the present times. Perhaps one of the inherent characteristics of the new generation of high technology is the difficulty of being self-sufficient and the need to share knowledge and components to prevent economic realities from slowing the constant technological improvements indispensable for the general development of all regions.

That process would seem to require facing the qualitative aspects of the arms race, particularly as regards weapons of mass destruction. It would seem

(Mr. Garcia Moritan, Argentina)

also to require agreement on balanced guidelines taking into account the emerging fact of the dual use of all technology while not affecting or undermining the need for continuous development, utilization and transfer of new technologies or the economic and industrial requirements involved.

We believe it possible to reconcile the creation of appropriate confidence-building measures aimed at strengthening international security with complementary steps based on a system of cooperation and free transfer and exchange of information on high technology taking also into account the commercial dimension. We hope the discussion on this item about to take place in the Disarmament Commission will further the search for a rational and equitable international consensus.

In our view it is necessary to encourage the adoption of confidence-building measures to promote openness and transparency. Measures such as existing ones on military budgets are useful, and since 1986 Argentina has been submitting the relevant information. But we should always bear in mind the limited scope of such measures without vigorous pursuit of effective disarmament measures, particularly considering that the hopes of last year are not yet a reality and that it is no mere abstract notion that weapons of mass destruction could be used, even if they have not been used recently.

With respect to nuclear disarmament, we must consider the way in which concepts of security concerning nuclear weapons should evolve in the light of the changing international situation.

Given the nearly unalterable existence of nuclear arsenals, we think we should consider the possibilities offered by the establishment of multilateral centres for nuclear alert and crisis control. In that context, my

(Mr. Garcia Moritan, Argentina)

delegation's proposal to the Conference on Disarmament remains valid; it would permit the practical and concrete integration of diverse States in exchanging information and in keeping sufficient lines of communication open in order to respond to unexpected situations without ever resorting to nuclear weapons or weapons of mass destruction.

The word "change" is a constant in today's political vocabulary. But another, less frequently used word has a special priority in the field of security: "stability". Both concepts suggest that the change we must promote and carry out requires indispensable global stability to build an adequate framework for peace and security.

In that context the indispensable regional progress must be matched by concord at the universal level and its reaffirmation through multilateral agreements which, through their scope, will supersede and encompass regional arrangements. The system of collective security envisioned by the framers of the Charter has the chance today of becoming reality. Together in this Commission we must define it and give it effect.

Mr. SILOVIC (Yugoslavia): First of all, Sir, I should like to extend to you the sincere congratulations of the Yugoslav delegation on your election to the chairmanship of this year's session of the Disarmament Commission. We are pleased to see you, a representative of neighbouring, friendly Austria, in the Chair, and we are confident that under your guidance our deliberations will be brought to a successful conclusion.

I avail myself of this opportunity also to congratulate the other members of the Bureau on their election; I particularly congratulate the Chairmen of the four working groups, who carry great responsibility with respect to the course of our discussions.

(Mr. Silovic, Yugoslavia)

We are embarking upon our activities this year in entirely different circumstances than in the past. Since our last session, great changes have taken place in international relations. The cold war is over. Great Powers continue to cooperate in all areas. The Berlin wall has been torn down, and Germany has been reunified. All this marked the beginning of new relations in Europe and contributed to the strengthening of European cooperation and the process of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. Moreover, some hotbeds of crisis showed signs of improvement.

At the same time, however, we witnessed the outbreak of the Persian Gulf crisis, which owing to its overall causes, its consequences and even its lessons transcended by far its local boundaries, leaving a mark on current international relations and placing in the forefront the indivisibility of world peace, security and development. Complex as it is, the crisis pointed particularly clearly to the problems of disarmament, from the threat of use of weapons of mass destruction to the need further to strengthen the non-proliferation system and to eliminate all classes of these dangerous weapons. Likewise, the crisis indicated in quite a new way that it was necessary to adopt measures of regional disarmament and create a system of security arrangements.

In this international atmosphere, the role of the United Nations is gaining importance, primarily as a place where the international community's concerted efforts to resolve the problems take shape. Never before has this been better demonstrated than in the case of the Gulf crisis, when the entire international community and our Organization took unprecedented unanimous action with a view to dealing with the problem. We hope such activities will be similarly manifested in other fields where many problems still persist, such as the field of disarmament.

(Mr. Silovic, Yugoslavia)

I should like also to stress on this occasion that we are following with the utmost attention the negotiations being pursued by the Soviet Union and the United States in the field of bilateral disarmament, particularly with respect to the conclusion of the strategic arms reduction (START) agreement, whose successful outcome would give further impetus to the advancement of the disarmament process.

(Mr. Silovic, Yugoslavia)

In addition to those major breakthroughs in international relations, our activities should particularly benefit from the positive results of last year's session of the Commission, during which the majority of the items on the agenda were dealt with. As a result, we have before us an agenda formulated in a different way, that is, we have four topics, three of which are entirely new. Moreover, last year we adopted the "Ways and Means to Enhance the Functioning of the Disarmament Commission", which should guide our discussions and make them constructive and efficient. This is a good opportunity to express my appreciation to the Permanent Representative of Indonesia, Mr. Nana Sutresna, the Chairman of last year's session of the Commission, for the remarkable way in which he conducted the session.

The topics on the Commision's agenda make it possible to touch upon and discuss all major disarmament issues. I will briefly refer to each of them.

Objective information on military matters represents one of the most important confidence-building measures. Within the United Nations, it has been elaborated mostly through the reduction of military budgets, the verification of the existing international agreements in the field of disarmament, and so on. As opposed to this, within the process of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), it has been dealt with in a more complex and detailed way. The instruments include: the exchange of relevant military data, including those on naval forces; notification of the major weapons systems intended for inclusion in the armed forces; information on military spending; information with a view to diminishing risks; prior notification of military activities and the right of States to observe military activities and to be notified of the military activities calendar.

(Mr. Silovic, Yugoslavia)

The experiences acquired in the application of such a system of instruments of objective information on military matters within the CSCE thus formulated can be useful in the process of their evaluation, elaboration and harmonization in other bodies and forums, including the United Nations. I am sure that they will be discussed further within Working Group I.

As a CSCE participating country, Yugoslavia will honour all obligations arising therein and will contribute to the drafting of the principles on objective information in the United Nations and elsewhere.

All deliberations on nuclear issues conducted so far within the Commission point to the sensitivity of this very important aspect of disarmament. Nevertheless, the way in which this topic has been formulated, as well as the possible structure of the debate within Working Group II, about which consultations had been held even prior to our session, provide sufficient guarantees that a useful debate will ensue. My delegation is of the opinion that emphasis should be placed on the role of the United Nations in the strengthening of the process of nuclear disarmament with a view to eliminating nuclear weapons. We feel that in this area the Organization could play an important role in creating a comprehensive international verification system.

We hold the view that the inclusion of the topic entitled, "Regional approach to disarmament within the context of global security" on the agenda of the Commission is of extreme importance, since it is indispensable for confidence-building and relaxation of tensions in quite a number of regions, which undoubtedly has a bearing on the global level.

Past efforts in the field of regional disarmament have resulted in cuts in military arsenals, strengthening of security and widening cooperation

(Mr. Silovic, Yugoslavia)

between States in some regions. Most often, they have been manifested through initiatives and efforts to create nuclear-weapon-free zones or zones without weapons of mass destruction. One of the major achievements in this area is undoubtedly the conclusion, at the end of last year, of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe.

As far as regional approaches to disarmament and the strengthening of regional security are concerned, in Europe at least, a special place belongs, of course, to the CSCE process, in which Yugoslavia has taken an active part ever since its inception. The CSCE process has led to the creation of a specific security system in Europe, characterized by a wide range of confidence-building measures, openness, transparency and cooperation in all spheres.

I should like to stress that from the very beginning of the CSCE process, based on common interests, confidence and understanding, the notion of security has been considered in its comprehensive meaning. In addition to its military aspect, that includes cooperation, development and human rights, which can be of universal importance. The CSCE achievements are to a large extent due also to the contribution made by the neutral and non-aligned countries, particularly at the time when international relations were characterized by bloc confrontation. Those countries, including my own, invested a great deal of effort to have many principles of non-aligned policy built into the foundations of European security.

We also attach particular importance to confidence-building in the ongoing developments in the Mediterranean region. Along with other non-aligned Mediterranean countries, Yugoslavia is making efforts with a view to easing tensions and improving the situation in that highly important

(Mr. Silovic, Yugoslavia)

region. We support the idea that the Conference on Security and Cooperation in the Mediterranean, similar to the CSCE, be convened at an appropriate time, in which all littoral and other interested States would take part.

The fourth topic on the agenda, "The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields", is nonetheless important and indeed topical, thanks to the enormous developments in science and technology to which we bear witness, particularly those used for military purposes or for the upgrading of existing weapons or military equipment and the development of new ones.

The delegation of Yugoslavia feels that in our deliberations we should strive, inter alia, to accelerate the process of conversion of military scientific-technological installations for peaceful purposes. We are also of the opinion that the relationship between science and technology and the environment will be increasingly important and should not be side-stepped in our discussions.

We are confident that the new circumstances in which we are starting our work will make it possible for us to have a comprehensive exchange of views on the topics, no matter how complex, sensitive or controversial they may be. Admittedly, the constructive discussion in itself, in our view, will make it possible for the Commission to achieve more fruitful results, which in turn may have a beneficial effect on the overall process of multilateral efforts in the field of disarmament.

Mr. SALANDER (Sweden): First of all, I want to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the functions of Chairman of this year's session of the Disarmament Commission. I am particularly glad to do so in view of your skilful contributions to the efforts to improve the Commission's functioning and productivity.

(Mr. Salander, Sweden)

The dramatic events which have occurred since the last session of the Commission have made the United Nations the focal point for efforts to restore peace and the respect for international law. In today's interdependent world, conflicts in one part of the globe inevitably have far-reaching effects on the rest of the international community.

(Mr. Salander, Sweden)

In this setting, effective international dialogue is essential. The United Nations provides the forum for such a dialogue.

The United Nations was crucial in mustering worldwide opposition to the invasion of Kuwait. Now the United Nations must be at the centre of efforts to tackle the difficult and diverse problems - both civilian and military - in the aftermath of the war.

The attention of the world community remains focused upon this region. How can the world community put to use the growing awareness of the need for joint efforts and multilateral action? In view of the great expectations placed in the world Organization, this is a compelling question that we have to grapple with both here and in the General Assembly.

The United Nations is in the process of implementing an ambitious package of measures to relieve human suffering and lay the foundations for lasting peace and security in the Gulf region.

The war in the Gulf dramatized the ramifications of international trade in conventional armaments and components for weapons of mass destruction. The massive deliveries of advanced weapons from several major suppliers to Iraq over the years put the Iraqi leadership in a position where it could launch its operation against Kuwait. In order to ensure viable peace and security the international arms trade has to be effectively limited and internationally controlled. This goes not only for the Gulf area but for everywhere else. In order to make such international control effective, both suppliers and recipients have to comply.

The first step in devising such a system would be to establish an international clearing house under the auspices of the United Nations for information about arms transfers. Such a United Nations register should cover

(Mr. Salander, Sweden)

all international arms transactions. It is vital that all countries cooperate fully and provide complete information about their respective exports and imports of arms.

Openness with regard to international arms transfers is an issue that we shall have to deal with under the agenda item on objective military information, which is the only "old" item on our agenda. The forthcoming discussions in the Disarmament Commission will give us an opportunity to continue our deliberations on the suggestions in last year's report. Openness and a willingness to provide information are vital, in particular with regard to weapons of mass destruction - nuclear, chemical and biological weapons. Openness is essential in the naval area - for instance, when vessels from one country enter the territorial waters of another sovereign State.

In adopting the resolution (44/116 E) entitled "Objective information on military matters", an overwhelming majority in the General Assembly, including four nuclear-weapon States, expressed the belief that the adoption of confidence-building measures to promote openness and transparency would contribute to the prevention of misperceptions of military capabilities and intentions. The General Assembly also expressed the belief that balanced and objective information on all military matters, in particular of nuclear-weapon States and other militarily significant States, would contribute to the building of confidence among States.

Objective information on military matters is a crucial confidence-building measure, both on a regional and on a global level. This has been amply illustrated by the far-reaching measures which resulted from the 34-State negotiations in Vienna and which are laid down in the Vienna document of November 1990.

(Mr. Salander, Sweden)

The three new items on our agenda are of great substance.

The nuclear item is important for the Disarmament Commission's agenda as a whole. The formulation of the item is at one and the same time very comprehensive and very focused. It contains the elements necessary to embark upon a process of dialogue on the matter, while at the same time keeping the ultimate goal in sight.

The process of nuclear disarmament has been at the focus of Swedish disarmament policies for decades. We shall continue to seek to play an active role in this area. The United Nations comprehensive study on nuclear weapons, in the preparation of which a representative of Sweden had the honour of serving as chairman, constitutes an authoritative summary of the issues involved and may serve as one of the elements in our discussions.

Multilateral deliberations aimed at nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament continue to be essential. The non-proliferation Treaty regime must be strengthened, and it is high time that the efforts to start serious negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty succeeded. As a contribution to that end, the Swedish delegation to the Conference on Disarmament will present a new draft for such a treaty during this year's session of the Conference.

In recent years the bilateral negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States on nuclear-arms reductions have given rise to great expectations. The summit meeting in Washington last summer engendered great hopes for speedy conclusion of a START agreement. It is my sincere hope that the United States and the Soviet Union will do their utmost to reach an agreement on START soon.

(Mr. Salander, Sweden)

In my view, the agenda item on a regional approach to disarmament may benefit from being focused on security arrangements, confidence-building measures and the role of the United Nations. The events since August last year show with extreme clarity the absolute necessity of a regional approach along these lines, in terms both of prevention and of reaction. From this it does not follow, of course, that the security problems of different regions of the world should be tackled in the same way.

In the European region, new winds have cleared the way for the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. Three historic agreements, impossible even to have thought of just a few years ago, have been concluded: the Charter of Paris, the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe and the Vienna document on confidence- and security-building. It is possible, even probable, that some of the experience gained in connection with those agreements can inspire similar initiatives and progress in other parts of the world. They show that, on the basis of a common understanding of fundamental human values, it is indeed possible to agree on reductions of armaments without diminishing the national security of any one State.

With a similar, subregional approach, the Nordic countries have recently presented a joint report on a zone free of nuclear weapons in our area. The report is the first joint phase of the long-standing discussion of this concept. Senior officials of the ministries for foreign affairs of the five Nordic countries have presented to their ministers a study of the security policy prerequisites for a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Nordic area, based upon the alliance commitments and policies of neutrality of the Governments concerned. The group of officials has also studied various elements in a

(Mr. Salander, Sweden)

possible zone arrangements. The group is not forwarding any concrete proposals for a zone. It will continue its joint analysis in the light of recent developments in the broader European context. In one or two months the report will be available in English for the benefit of the members of the Disarmament Commission. It is worth noting that this is the first time since the establishment more than 40 years ago of the present Nordic security-related structure that the five Governments have adopted a unanimous document in the fields of national and international security policy.

(Mr. Salander, Sweden)

The Gulf area and the Middle East are once again devastated by war and human suffering, like so many times before. In spite of all the problems still to be solved, I am pleased to note that there are also possibilities open today for slowly building up confidence between former adversaries which may imply that old conflicts can be dealt with in a new spirit. Starting with confidence-building, it should be possible to control regional armaments and eventually reduce them to lower levels. Last year's interesting United Nations study on a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East should be one of the starting-points of the discussion.

Finally, in our deliberations on the agenda item on science and technology, we should examine not only how science and technology have been used for destructive purposes; we should also discuss their application to beneficial ends, not least for disarmament. In particular, we have to consider how the United Nations can make use of science and technology for disarmament in the present day and age. In this context, we should take advantage of the study on the role of the United Nations in the verification of disarmament agreements. I hope that this new agenda item will prove as dynamic and conceptually valid as its title suggests.

Effective international deliberations require an effective setting. My Government welcomes the decisions taken to streamline the way the Disarmament Commission operates. In this year's session, we still have to demonstrate that the criteria of reform and the decisions we shall have taken are effective and meaningful, and that we - in all delegations - are able to let the new way of streamlining the agenda make our work more productive.

(Mr. Salander, Sweden)

For years we have also struggled to develop more efficient methods of work in the General Assembly. Revived hopes for the United Nations have given new impetus to reforms of this kind.

In matters of international security, there is rarely a quick fix. The best must not be made the enemy of the good. Sometimes, the most constructive approach may be to accept what initially appears to be a second-best solution, while mobilizing further support for the underlying ideas.

Diplomacy requires both patience and impatience: only the United Nations can provide a forum to resolve pressing and urgent global matters, a forum where the diverse interests of all countries can be articulated and duly examined; only the United Nations can provide a setting for a clearing-house on the trade in conventional arms. Equally, only negotiations and agreements reached by all nations can ensure the non-proliferation, destruction and prohibition of weapons of mass destruction.

Dialogue is the essence of diplomacy: we have assembled here both in order to present our views and to listen to others. Dialogue is of the essence, especially when we expect that the views of others will differ from our own.

Mr. KOSTOV (Bulgaria): May I first of all, Sir, extend the warm congratulations of my delegation on your election as Chairman of this important session of the Disarmament Commission, and wish you success in leading us towards meaningful deliberations and practical results.

Please allow me to convey through you our best wishes to the Chairmen of the four consulting groups, and to your able predecessor in the chair, Ambassador Sutresna of Indonesia.

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

The delegation of the Republic of Bulgaria notes with satisfaction that our work has got off to a good start. We share and understand the unanimous wish of all delegations that have spoken so far to build upon the foundations that the reform in the Commission's machinery and proceedings has produced.

It is our conviction that general political developments in contemporary international relations are favourable to our efforts. The role of the United Nations in world affairs is becoming more visible and assertive in many areas, especially in maintaining international peace and security. We welcome the growing role of the United Nations as a major catalyst for the multilateral approach to issues in the disarmament field.

In the opinion of my delegation, the problems of disarmament are undergoing an evolution brought about by the elimination of East-West confrontation and the reduction in the threat of war. The conflict in the Persian Gulf, which had disturbed the progress towards improved international stability and the establishment of foundations for a new world order, also left an imprint on disarmament efforts. There is a widespread conviction, however, that in the aftermath of the conflict the world will not be the same. The question of guaranteeing national security and protection against aggression has been presented in a new light. The role of the United Nations as guardian of the territorial integrity and political independence of States, particularly of smaller States, has been radically enhanced.

The limitation and elimination of certain categories of weapons of mass destruction, the adoption of international legal instruments for regulating arms control and disarmament and increasing openness, predictability and confidence in military matters are of particular significance amongst the

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

principal trends in action to strengthen international stability. In this respect, the Disarmament Commission, in its capacity as the principal deliberative body, will continue to play an increasingly important role in considering and defining the agenda and the immediate goals in arms control and disarmament.

Before making some brief comments on the items before this year's session, I would like to join with those delegations which paid tributes to the bilateral disarmament agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union. We welcome the successful implementation of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles and also the prospects for a START agreement. Our support for nuclear arms reduction and nuclear disarmament is combined with a strong commitment to nuclear non-proliferation.

We attach particular importance to the elaboration and institutionalization of an efficient mechanism for guaranteeing the security of non-nuclear-weapon States. Bulgaria favours achieving some degree of progress in efforts to afford the non-nuclear-weapon States guarantees against the use of nuclear weapons in such a way as to contribute to strengthening the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

Bulgaria for its part expresses the hope that its participation in the voluntary international regimes for the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and missile technologies will contribute to the lifting of all technological and trade restrictions and open up possibilities for wider international cooperation.

On the second of the new items on the agenda - "Regional approach to disarmament" - we share the general approach expressed by the Twelve. We shall strive to contribute to the debate in this area. The preliminary discussion in the working group has been an honest effort to map the route ahead.

Bulgaria looks forward to useful and result-oriented deliberations on the item entitled "The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields". Here again, I would like to express our satisfaction with the preliminary consultations in the working group. We are hopeful about the prospects of exploring in a multilateral setting the avenues of international cooperation in the use of scientific and technological achievements for disarmament-related purposes. We are encouraged by the highly successful United Nations Conferences organized by the Department for Disarmanent Affairs in Sendai, Japan, and in Moscow on highly topical issues in this field.

As to the work we are to continue on the item on objective information on military matters, I would like to underline the new approach of my delegation. Not only has Bulgaria recognized its significance and beneficial effect on all disarmament issues, but we have taken steps in order to apply it in our practice. We look forward to the deliberations in the working group.

(Mr. Kostov, Bulgaria)

In conclusion, I should like to assure you, Sir, of the full cooperation of the Bulgarian delegation in your endeavours to lead this important body to a fruitful and truly substantive session.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.